



Approved
13 JUL 2015
CFV

Minutes
Architectural Review Board
June 8, 2015
Council Chambers, City Hall
Fredericksburg, Virginia

Members Present

Kerri S. Barile, Chair
Jamie Scully, Vice Chair
Susan Pates
John Harris

Members Absent

John Van Zandt
Sabina Weitzman
Kenneth McFarland

Staff

Erik Nelson
Phaun Moore

Dr. Barile called the Architectural Review Board meeting to order at 7:34 p.m.

OPENING REMARKS

Dr. Barile determined that a quorum was present. Mr. Nelson stated that public notice requirements had been met.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

There were no additions or changes to the agenda.

Mr. Harris made a motion to accept the agenda as presented. Mr. Scully seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

REVIEW OF MINUTES

There were no changes to the meeting minutes from May 11, 2015 and the supplementary meeting minutes from May 28, 2015.

Mr. Harris made a motion to approve both sets of minutes as presented. Ms. Pates seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

DISCLOSURE OF EX PARTE COMMUNICATIONS

Dr. Barile asked if any Board member had participated in any ex parte communications on any item before the Board.

Dr. Barile said she had a brief conversation with John Hennessy, of the National Park Service, regarding Item #4, partial demolition of 401-403 Sophia Street. Mr. Hennessy had asked for clarification on which side was being demolished.

DISCLOSURE OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Dr. Barile asked if any Board member had a conflict of interest for any item before the Board.

Ms. Pates said she had property listed next to 315 Charles Street.

Mr. Nelson said he would make note. He also reminded Dr. Barile that if any other Board members showed up, to ask if they had participated in any ex parte communications or had any conflicts of interest, so that it could be reflected in the record.

APPLICATIONS- NEW BUSINESS

1. Luann Peters – Signs at 1004B Caroline Street.

The applicant was present. There was no public comment.

Mr. Scully asked why they would not install sign #2 below the architectural, brick detail since there was not an application for an awning.

Mr. Nelson said that the sign fit inside what was once an entablature, but the sign could be moved down.

Mr. Scully said that the sign was not completely contained within the entablature and that the proposed location overlapped the bottom of the brick detail.

The applicant said that the brick was already recessed one inch so the sign would be flush and there were anchors already there from a previous sign.

Mr. Harris commented that the sign did not cover the entire brick detail and he thought the architectural uniqueness was still evident.

Ms. Pates said she understood that lowering the sign would encroach into the area that could be used by the business below.

Dr. Barile commented on the difficulty of making a decision after the sign had already been put up.

Mr. Scully suggested that the sign should not cover the architectural detail behind it. He said there were only 8 segments of the architectural detail showing and 14 were covered.

Dr. Barile agreed with Mr. Scully and said she prefers that the brick and architectural detail not be covered.

Mr. Harris made a motion to approve both signs as presented. Ms. Pates seconded.

Dr. Barile said she preferred the sign be lowered so that it would not mask the architectural detail.

Mr. Scully asked the applicants why they did not want to lower the sign.

The applicant said that if the sign was lowered, it would be directly above the storefront window and they did not want to interfere with the business below.

Dr. Barile stated a motion had been made and seconded. The Board voted 2-2, with Dr. Barile and Mr. Scully opposed. Dr. Barile asked if there was an alternative motion.

Mr. Scully said the sign obscures the majority of one of the very few architectural details of that building. He suggested that they move the sign below the border or center it.

Mr. Scully made a motion to approve both signs, with sign #2 to be located below the soldier course of the architectural detailing. Mr. Harris seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

2. John Burger – Sign at 1216 Caroline Street.

The applicant was not present. There was no public comment. There were no comments from the Board.

Mr. Harris made a motion to approve the sign as presented. Mr. Scully seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Dr. Barile said the property owners should be commended on the rehabilitation of the property.

3. Mary L. Hicks – Fence at 1010 Prince Edward Street.

The applicant was present. There was no public comment.

Mr. Harris said he knew the applicants, but had not discussed the case.

Mr. Scully made a motion to approve the fence as presented. Ms. Pates seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

4. Leah Watson – Partial demolition at 401-403 Sophia Street.

The applicant was present. There was no public comment.

Mr. Scully asked what the plans were for the remaining structure after the demolition.

Ms. Watson said they were going to stabilize the building and make it habitable.

Mr. Scully asked if they were going to do that in phases or all at once.

Ms. Watson said they were going to work in stages, concentrating on stabilizing the exterior first. She said the interior was going to be a massive project.

Dr. Barile clarified that the applicant's intent was to repair the remaining side. Ms. Watson confirmed that it was.

Ms. Pates asked if the stone foundation still existed.

Ms. Watson said it still existed and that it was in reasonably good shape. She said they plan to stabilize the stone foundation and work on making the appearance of the exterior more appealing.

Ms. Pates said that the submitted engineer's report noted that the soil at the left rear corner should be evaluated prior to any sort of reconstruction, and she asked for elaboration.

Ms. Watson said the left rear corner was lower due to settling.

Ms. Pates clarified it was due to settling and not soil problems. Ms. Watson said that was correct.

Dr. Barile said that she was generally against demolition, however she would vote in favor of it in situations where the integrity is so poor that it has a negative impact on surrounding buildings. She said she had a conversation with John Henessey and reassured him that the 1843 portion of the building would not be demolished. Dr. Barile reported that Mr. Henessey had said that from the National Park Service perspective, demolition would not have an adverse affect on the integrity of the historic portion that had existed during the Civil War.

Dr. Barile said her biggest concern was what might be found after demolition and advised Ms. Watson to contact Mr. Nelson and arrange for a supplemental meeting if any concerns were to arise. She said she appreciated the reuse of the wood siding.

Dr. Barile informed Ms. Watson that once demolition is complete, she is shrinking the footprint by half, and that additions in the future may be more challenging than the demolition. She said she appreciated Ms. Watson's thoroughness and thoughtful consideration of the historic fabric of the building.

Mr. Scully said that approving a demolition was difficult, but it was a necessary compromise. He thanked Ms. Watson for saving what she could.

Mr. Scully made a motion to approve the partial demolition as presented.

Mr. Harris asked for clarification on the suggestion that a gable vent be installed on the demolition side of the building.

Mr. Scully said that Mr. Nelson had noted it as a suggestion and Mr. Scully thought that keeping it a suggestion would be appropriate.

Mr. Harris seconded Mr. Scully's motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Dr. Barile and Mr. Harris wished Ms. Watson good luck.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Informal discussion – 315 Charles Street.

Mr. Nelson said that the person interested in this property had not shown up.

There was a question as to which property this was. Mr. Nelson said the correct address was actually 315 Prince Edward Street.

Mr. Scully made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Harris seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 8:26 p.m.



Kerri S. Barile, ARB Chair